APPENDIX A

Statement of Work
Unilateral Administrative Order
For Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study

Brine Service Company, Inc. Superfund Site
Corpus Christi, Nueces County, Texas

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 6

October 2009

9149671

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attachments

Attachment

A - Schedule of Deliverables/Meetings
B - Guidance Documents
C - Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements

I: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Purpose of the Statement of Work

The purpose of this Statement of Work (SOW) is to set forth certain requirements of the Unilateral Administrative Order (UAO) for implementation of the Work pertaining to a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Brine Service Company (BSC), Inc. Superfund Site (hereinafter "the Site"). The Respondents identified in the UAO shall undertake the RI/FS according to the UAO, including, but not limited to, this SOW.

2.0 Objectives of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

The objectives of the RI/FS are to investigate the nature and extent of contamination at or from the Site and to develop and evaluate potential remedial alternatives, in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601, et seq.); as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA); and in accordance with the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (National Contingency Plan [NCP]). Specifically, these objectives are to determine the presence or absence, types, and quantities (concentrations) of contaminants; mechanism of contaminant release to pathway(s); direction of pathway(s) transport; boundaries of source(s) and pathway(s); and environmental/public health receptors.

3.0 Scope of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

The general scope of the RI/FS shall be to address all contamination at or from the Site resulting from the hazardous substances present at the Site.

4.0 Description of the Site

The Site is located approximately 6.5 miles west from downtown Corpus Christi along the north side of IH-37 and east-northeast of the intersection at Goldston Road (UAO, Appendix B - Site Map). Corpus Christi is situated along the southern Gulf Coast of Texas. The Site is located in the Nueces-Rio Grande Coastal Basin and lies approximately 25 feet above sea level. The geodetic coordinates of the Site are 27°48'55.34 " north latitude and 97°30'30.98 " west longitude. The legal description of the Site is "Lots 2 - 8, Block 1, Goldston Addition."

The earliest industrial use was a right-of-way easement granted in 1940 to Houston Gulf Gas Company to construct a pipe line across part of the Site. In 1955-57, the Goldston Company, Inc., (Goldston) was the grantee of some 12 acres of the Site. Goldston was a general construction and heavy equipment company which began operation in 1955 on Lot 8 and subsequently acquired additional property. Occupants of this property up to 1986 were subsidiaries of Goldston Corporation. The facility was not operated after 1985, and it was closed in 1998.

James Goldston is the president of Boomerang Corporation, the current owner of Lots 2-5 and 8. Brine Service Company (BSC) obtained a 1.81 acre tract in 1957. BSC was a previous owner of all, or portions, of the south pit area located on certain lots of the Site. Mr. Henderson is the President of BSC. James M. Goldston is the principal of both Boomerang and Goldston.

Prior to its use for waste disposal, the BSC property was quarried for sand and caliche. Aerial photographs show that pit excavations began at the Site prior to 1956 and contained liquid until filled in the early 1970s. Observations of the aerial photographs indicated the presence of two pit areas, a south pit area located at the northeast intersection of Goldston Road and IH-37, and a north pit area located immediately north of the south pit. From the 1940s through the 1960s oil field (e.g., drilling fluids) and refinery waste were disposed of at the south pit. The south pit area, as seen in a 1960 aerial photograph, revealed a suspicious dark mottled appearance of the liquid in the pit, which may be an indication of floating hydrocarbons. There is no documentation that the north pit received wastes; however, it might have received runoff from the south pit. There is no documentation that either of these pits were lined. The north pit area was backfilled sometime between 1962 and 1965. The south pit area was completely filled in by late 1973.

The Site is comprised of the former waste disposal pits (north and south pits) located on property formerly owned and operated by Brine Service Company. A portion of the pit area reportedly received oil field wastes, such as drilling fluids, and/or refinery wastes from as early as 1946 through the 1960s. The Site was discovered on November 3, 1997, when a Koch Pipeline Company (Koch) representative notified the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission Region 14 [TNRCC, now the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)] staff of an apparent former waste disposal site. Koch reported that during pipeline excavations through the former Brine Service Company property, approximately 3,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil was excavated from a trench that was to be used for the installation of interconnecting pipelines between two nearby refineries. Observations of the excavation area reported by a TNRCC inspector revealed that the floor and walls of the excavation were visibly stained with hydrocarbons and that ground water seeping into the excavation had a hydrocarbon sheen. Laboratory analyses results received from Koch for soil samples collected from the excavated materials at the Site indicated the following hazardous substances were encountered: barium, cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury, fluorene, 2-methylnaphthalene, naphthalene, phenanthrene, benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, xylenes, 2,4-dimethylphenol, acenaphthene, 2-methylphenol (o-cresol), 3&4 methylphenol (m&p cresol), and phenol. Total benzene levels were documented as high as 79,000 micrograms per kilogram (μg/kg). Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure benzene levels ranged from 250 micrograms/liter (μg/L) to 1,700 μg/L. Total petroleum hydrocarbon levels were detected as high as 52,000 milligrams/kilogram. Total mercury levels were found in all of the waste characterization samples collected. Mercury levels ranged from 0.50 to 10.7 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) which were significantly above background.

During the week of February 14-17, 2000, the TNRCC's Superfund Site Discovery and Assessment Program conducted sampling activities at the Site as part of a screening site

inspection [SSI, Screening Site Inspection Report (October 2000)]. The purpose of this investigation was to document the release(s) or potential release(s) of hazardous substances from the Site. All of the source samples collected during this sampling event were analyzed for Organic Target Compound List (TCL) and Inorganic Target Analyte List (TAL) constituents. The analytical results documented organic and inorganic concentrations greater than or equal to the background sample(s), or sample quantitation limits if not found in background. This subsequent sampling confirmed the presence of metals and organic compounds in the north and south pit areas and in Tule Lake. The SSI Report states that, "The hazardous substance mercury was found in the Tule Lake wetland area sediment samples, qualifying as observed releases, can be attributed to Source 1 [pit area] at the Brine Service Company Site."

The known and suspected sources of contamination at the Site include the buried impoundments. The types of Contaminants of Potential Concern (COPCs) that shall be investigated include organics and inorganics. The possibly affected media to be investigated include soils, ground water, surface water, air, and sediments. The known and potential routes of migration that shall be considered during the RI/FS include, among others, overland flow (identified in the Hazard Ranking System Documentation Record), subsurface migration of COPCs from the buried impoundments to surface/subsurface soils and ground water and the possible migration to the sediments and surface waters of the Surface Water Drainage Ditch (SWDD). Another potential route of migration would be the migration of COPCs from the sediments and surface waters of the SWDD adjacent to the buried impoundments to the sediments and surface waters of the SWDD located to the north of Up River Road and its depositional area in a wetland area known as Tule Lake.

Surface water downstream of the Site is saline and therefore not used for drinking. There are no domestic or public water supply wells within 1 mile of the Site. Surface water drainage from the Site enters a drainage ditch located along the east side of the property. The ditch travels north approximately ½ mile and empties into a wetland area known as Tule Lake. Tule Lake is a brackish shallow water wetland area and is a Texas Parks and Wildlife sanctuary containing gulls, pelicans, and other aquatic birds. Tule Lake is also a habitat for several State-Listed Threatened Species. Tule Lake flows into Corpus Christi Inner Harbor, which in turn flows into Corpus Christi Bay. Corpus Christi Bay is an estuarine subtidal area and has been nominated into the National Estuary Bay Program. The bay is used for recreational and commercial fishing.

Land use surrounding the Site is commercial/industrial. The Nueces Occupational Medical Clinic is located to the north of the property. Three petrochemical refineries identified as Citgo, Valero, and Flint Hills are approximately ½ mile east, 1 mile east, and 1 mile northwest of the Site, respectively.

The nearest residential area is approximately 0.4 miles west-southwest of the Site. Because of the industrial nature of this area, additional residential development is unlikely. The 1990 U.S. Bureau of Census data reports 27 housing units and 71 residents within a ½-mile radius of the Site.

The volumes of wastes currently present at the Site have not been determined. This information will be obtained during the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study currently being planned for the Site.

II. ROLE OF THE EPA

5.0 Role of the EPA

The EPA's approval of deliverables, including, but not limited to, submissions, allows the Respondents to proceed to the next steps in implementing the Work of the RI/FS. The EPA's approval does not imply any warranty of performance, nor does it imply that the RI/FS, when completed, will function properly and be ultimately accepted by the EPA. The EPA retains the right to disapprove submissions during the RI/FS. The EPA may disapprove deliverables including, but not limited to, submissions concerning such matters as the contractor selection, plans and specifications, work plans, processes, sampling, analysis and any other deliverables within the context of the UAO. If a submission is unacceptable to the EPA, the EPA may require the Respondents to make modifications in the submission, and the EPA may require the Respondents to do additional work to support those modifications. That is, if a submission reports certain work that is unacceptable to the EPA, the EPA may require the Respondents to modify the submission text and to perform the work until it is acceptable to the EPA. The Respondents shall modify the submission and perform the work as required by the EPA.

III. RESPONDENT'S KEY PERSONNEL

6.0 Respondent's Project Coordinator

When necessary, as determined by the EPA, the EPA will meet with the Respondents and discuss the performance and capabilities of the Respondent's Project Coordinator. When the Project Coordinator's performance is not satisfactory, as determined by the EPA, the Respondents shall take action, as requested by the EPA, to correct the deficiency. If, at any time, the EPA determines that the Project Coordinator is unacceptable for any reason, the Respondents, at the EPA's request, shall bar the Project Coordinator from any work under the AOC and give notice of the Respondent's selected new Project Coordinator to the EPA.

7.0 Respondent's Quality Assurance Official

Oversight, including, but not limited to confirmation sampling, by the Respondent's Quality Assurance Official (QAO) will be used to provide confirmation and assurance to the Respondents and to the EPA that the Respondents are performing the RI/FS in a manner that will meet the Performance Standards. The QAO shall ensure that the work performed by the Respondents meets the standards in the Quality Assurance Project Plan described in this SOW. The QAO shall selectively test and inspect the work performed by the Respondents.

IV. DELIVERABLES AND TASKS TO BE PERFORMED

8.0 Conduct of the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study

This SOW specifies the Work to be performed and the deliverables which shall be produced by the Respondents. The Respondents shall conduct the RI/FS in accordance with this SOW and all applicable guidance that the EPA uses in conducting RI/FS projects under CERCLA, as amended by SARA, as well as any additional requirements in the UAO. The Respondents shall furnish all necessary personnel, materials, and services necessary for, and incidental to, performance of the RI/FS, except as otherwise specified in the UAO.

9.0 Submittal of Deliverables

All draft and final deliverables specified in this SOW shall be provided in hard copy, by the Respondents, to the EPA (three copies), EPA's RI/FS Oversight Assistant (one copy), TCEQ (two copies), and the Federal/State Natural Resource Trustees[1] (one copy each). Draft and final deliverables shall be provided in electronic format (specifically, Microsoft ® Word Version 9.0 [or higher and as specified by the EPA] for Windows™ and Adobe® PDF format) to the EPA, EPA's RI/FS Oversight Assistant, TCEQ, and the Federal/State Natural Resource Trustees. Final deliverables shall be provided in hard copy and electronic format (specifically, Adobe® PDF format) to the Information Repository(ies) established for the Site. The EPA shall be responsible for placing the required deliverables into the Information Repository(ies). The Respondents shall provide the EPA with any other documentation for the Information Repository(ies) as requested by the EPA's Remedial Project Manager. Additionally, all deliverables specified in this SOW shall be submitted, by the Respondents, according to the requirements of this SOW and Attachment A of this SOW (Schedule of Deliverables/Meetings).

10.0 Development of Deliverables

All deliverables shall be developed in accordance with the guidance documents listed in Attachment B[2] (Guidance Documents) to this SOW. If the EPA disapproves of or requires revisions to any of these deliverables, in whole or in part, the Respondents shall submit to the EPA, after receiving the EPA's directions or comments, revised plans which are responsive to such directions or comments within the time frames specified in Attachment A (Schedule of Deliverables/Meetings) and the UAO.

---

[1]The Federal/State Natural Resource Trustees for the Site have been identified as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, and Texas General Land Office.

[2]Attachment B of this SOW does not include all guidance documents that are applicable to the RI/FS for the Site. The Respondents should consult with EPA's Remedial Project Manager for additional guidance and to ensure that the guidance documents listed in Attachment B have not been superseded by more recent guidance.

11.0 Tasks to be Performed by the Respondents

The Respondents shall perform each of the following Tasks (Tasks 1-13) as specified in this SOW. These Tasks shall be developed in accordance with the guidance documents listed in Attachment B (Guidance Documents) to this SOW and any additional guidance applicable to the RI/FS process.

11.1 Task 1: Project Planning

The purpose of Task 1 (Project Planning) is to determine how the RI/FS will be managed and controlled. The following activities shall be performed by the Respondents as part of Task 1.

11.1.1 Scoping Phase Meeting

The Respondents shall contact the EPA's Remedial Project Manager after the effective date of the UAO to schedule a scoping phase meeting. The scoping phase meeting shall occur within fourteen (14) calendar days after the effective date of the UAO. This meeting may include a Site visit.

The known and suspected sources of contamination at the Site include the buried impoundments. The types of Contaminants of Potential Concern (COPCs) that shall be investigated include organics and inorganics. The possibly affected media to be investigated include soils, ground water, surface water, air, and sediments. The known and potential routes of migration that shall be considered during the RI/FS include, among others, overland flow (identified in the Hazard Ranking System Documentation Record), subsurface migration of COPCs from the buried impoundments to surface/subsurface soils and ground water and the possible migration to the sediments and surface waters of the Surface Water Drainage Ditch (SWDD). Another potential route of migration would be the migration of COPCs from the sediments and surface waters of the SWDD adjacent to the buried impoundments to the sediments and surface waters of the SWDD located to the north of Up River Road and its depositional area in a wetland area known as Tule Lake.

11.1.2 Evaluation of Existing Site Data

The Respondents shall compile, review, and evaluate all existing Site data. The Respondents shall refer to Table 2-1 (Data Collection Information Sources) of the RI/FS Guidance for a list of data collection information sources. The Respondents shall exhaust, as necessary, all of those sources in compiling the data.

The Respondents shall compile all existing information describing hazardous substance sources, migration pathways, and potential human and environmental receptors. The Respondents shall compile all existing data relating to the varieties and quantities of hazardous substances released at or from the Site. The Respondents shall compile and review all available data relating to past disposal practices of any kind on and near the Site. The Respondents shall

compile existing data concerning the physical and chemical characteristics of the hazardous substances, and their distribution among the environmental media (ground water, soil, surface water, sediments, and air) on and near the Site.

The Respondents shall compile existing data which resulted from any previous sampling events that may have been conducted on and near the Site. The Respondents shall gather existing data which describes previous responses that have been conducted on and near the Site by local, state, federal, or private parties.

The Respondents shall gather existing information regarding geology, hydrogeology, hydrology, meteorology, and ecology of the Site. The Respondents shall gather existing data regarding background ground water, background soil, background surface water, background sediments, and background air characteristics (if necessary). The Respondents shall gather existing data regarding demographics and land use. The Respondents shall gather existing data which identifies and locates residential, municipal, or industrial water wells on and near the Site. The Respondents shall gather existing data which identifies surface water uses for areas surrounding the Site including, but not limited to, downstream of the Site. The Respondents shall gather existing information describing the flora and fauna of the Site. The Respondents shall gather existing data regarding threatened, endangered, or rare species; sensitive environmental areas; or critical habitats on and near the Site. The Respondents shall compile existing results from any previous biological testing to document any known ecological effect such as acute or chronic toxicity or bioaccumulation in the food chain.

The Respondents shall use data compiled and reviewed to describe additional data needed to characterize the Site, to better define potential applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), and to develop a range of preliminarily identified remedial alternatives.

11.2 Task 2: Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study Work Plan

The Respondents shall prepare and submit a Draft RI/FS Work Plan (WP) within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. The Respondents shall use information from appropriate EPA guidance and technical direction provided by the EPA's Remedial Project Manager as the basis for preparing the Draft RI/FS WP. A Final RI/FS WP shall be submitted to the EPA within fourteen (14) calendar days after the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft RI/FS WP.

Specifically, the Draft RI/FS WP shall present a statement of the problem(s) and potential problem(s) posed by the Site and the objectives of the RI/FS. Furthermore, the Draft RI/FS WP shall include a Site background summary setting forth the Site description which includes the geographic location of the Site, and to the extent possible, a description of the Site's physiography, hydrology, geology, and demographics; the Site's ecological, cultural and natural resource features; a synopsis of the Site history and a description of previous responses that have been conducted at the Site by local, state, federal, or private parties; and a summary of the existing data in terms of physical and chemical characteristics of the contaminants identified, and

their distribution among the environmental media at the Site. In addition, the Draft RI/FS WP shall include a description of the Site management strategy developed during scoping, and a preliminary identification of remedial alternatives and data needs for evaluation of remedial alternatives. The Draft RI/FS WP shall reflect coordination with treatability study requirements (Task 10 [Treatability Studies]) and will show a process for and manner of identifying Federal and State chemical-, location-, and action-specific Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs, Attachment C [Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements]).

Finally, the major part of the Draft RI/FS WP shall be a detailed description of the Tasks (Tasks 1-13) to be performed, information needed for each Task and for the Baseline Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessments, information to be produced during and at the conclusion of each Task, and a description of the Work products and deliverables that the Respondents will submit to the EPA. This includes the deliverables set forth in the remainder of this SOW; a schedule for each of the required activities which is consistent with the EPA's guidance documents; monthly reports to the EPA as specified in Attachment A (Schedule of Deliverables/Meetings); and meetings and presentations to the EPA at the conclusion of each major phase of the RI/FS. The Respondents shall refer to the EPA's guidance document entitled, "Interim Final Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA" (EPA 1988b) which describes the RI/FS WP format and the required content.

The Respondents are responsible for fulfilling additional data and analysis needs identified by the EPA consistent with the general scope and objectives of this RI/FS. Because of the nature of the Site and the iterative nature of the RI/FS, additional data requirements and analyses may be identified throughout the process. If any significant additional Work is required to meet the objectives stated in the RI/FS WP, based upon new information obtained during the RI/FS, the Respondents shall submit a Draft RI/FS WP Amendment to the EPA for review and approval prior to any additional Work being conducted in accordance with the UAO. The EPA may, at its discretion, give verbal approval for Work to be conducted prior to providing written approval of the Draft RI/FS WP Amendment

The Respondents shall develop the Draft RI/FS WP in conjunction with the Draft RI/FS Sampling and Analysis Plan (Task 3 [RI/FS Sampling and Analysis Plan]) and the Draft RI/FS Site Health and Safety Plan (Task 4 [RI/FS Site Health and Safety Plan]), although each plan may be submitted to the EPA under separate cover. The Draft RI/FS WP shall include a comprehensive description of the Work to be performed, the methodologies to be utilized, and a corresponding schedule for completion. In addition, the Draft RI/FS WP shall include the rationale for performing the required activities as well as the following site specific plans:

11.2.1 Site Management Plan

The Respondents shall prepare and submit a Draft Site Management Plan (SMP) within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. The Draft SMP shall provide the EPA with a written understanding of how access, security, contingency procedures, management responsibilities, and waste disposal are to be addressed. A

Final SMP shall be submitted to the EPA within fourteen (14) calendar days after the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft SMP.

11.2.2 Pollution Control and Mitigation Plan

The Respondents shall prepare and submit a Draft Pollution Control and Mitigation Plan (PCMP) within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. The Draft PCMP shall outline the process, procedures, and safeguards that will be used to ensure contaminants or pollutants are not released off-site during the implementation of the RI. Any plans and procedures prepared during the RI/FS should be referenced or adapted whenever possible (i.e., sediment and erosion control plan and air monitoring plan). A Final PCMP shall be submitted to the EPA within fourteen (14) calendar days after the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft PCMP.

11.2.3 Transportation and Disposal Plan

The Respondents shall prepare and submit a Draft Transportation and Disposal Plan (TDP) within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. The Draft TDP shall outline how wastes that are encountered during the RI will be managed and disposed of. The Respondents shall specify the procedures that will be followed when wastes will be transported off-site for storage, treatment, and/or disposal. A Final TDP shall be submitted to the EPA within fourteen (14) calendar days after the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft TDP.

11.2.4 Data Management Plan

The Respondents shall prepare and submit a Draft Data Management Plan (DMP) within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. The Draft DMP shall outline the procedures for storing, handling, accessing, and securing data collected during the RI (e.g., requirements for project management systems and software, minimum data requirements, data format and backup data management). A Final DMP shall be submitted to the EPA within fourteen (14) calendar days after the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft DMP.

11.2.5 Conceptual Site Model

The Respondents shall prepare and submit a Draft Conceptual Site Model (CSM) within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. The Draft CSM shall be submitted in "flow diagram" and "schematic" formats. The Respondents shall use information from appropriate EPA guidance and technical direction provided by the EPA's Remedial Project Manager as the basis for preparing the Draft CSM. The Draft CSM should be included with the Draft RI/FS Work Plan. A Final CSM shall be submitted to the EPA within fourteen (14) calendar days after the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft CSM.

The preliminary CSM for the Site, which can be refined as more data is collected, shall include "known and suspected" sources of contamination, types of contaminants and affected media, "known and potential" routes of migration, and "known and potential" human and ecological receptors. The development of the CSM will assist in identifying locations where sampling of the soils, ground water, surface water, air, and sediments is necessary and will guide the field sampling for the Site. An optimal sampling design depends on an accurate CSM.

11.2.6 Other Plans

Other plans, as directed by the EPA's Remedial Project Manager, may be identified throughout the RI/FS process and the Respondents shall submit these plans to the EPA according to an approved schedule.

Reuse Assessment - If the EPA, in its sole discretion, determines that a Reuse Assessment is necessary, Respondents will perform the Reuse Assessment in accordance with the SOW, RI/FS Work Plan and applicable guidance. The Reuse Assessment should provide sufficient information to develop realistic assumptions of the reasonably anticipated future uses for the Site. Respondents shall prepare the Reuse Assessment in accordance with EPA guidance, including, but not limited to the guidance entitled, "Reuse Assessments: A Tool To Implement The Superfund Land Use Directive" (OSWER Directive 9355.7-06P, June 4, 2001 or subsequently issued guidance).

11.3 Task 3: RI/FS Sampling and Analysis Plan

The Respondents shall prepare and submit to the EPA a Draft RI/FS Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. This Draft RI/FS SAP shall provide a mechanism for planning field activities and shall consist of an RI/FS Field Sampling Plan and Quality Assurance Project Plan. A Final RI/FS SAP shall be submitted to the EPA within fourteen (14) calendar days after the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft RI/FS SAP.

11.3.1 RI/FS Field Sampling Plan

The RI/FS Field Sampling Plan (FSP) shall define in detail the sampling and data gathering methods that will be used for the project to define the nature and extent of contamination and risk assessment-related studies (Task 9, Risk Assessments). It shall include, but not be limited to, sampling objectives, sample location and frequency, sampling equipment and procedures, and sample handling and analysis. The RI/FS FSP shall contain a completed Sample Design Collection Worksheet and a Method Selection Worksheet. These worksheet templates can be found in the EPA's guidance document entitled, "Guidance for Data Useability in Risk Assessment" (EPA 1992a). In addition, the FSP shall include a comprehensive description of the Site including geology; location; and physiographic, hydrological, ecological, cultural, and natural resource features; a brief synopses of the history of the Site; summary of existing data; and information on fate and transport and effects of chemicals. As such, the Respondents shall provide a strategy that includes both biased sampling and random sampling.

The Respondents shall include a Data Quality Objectives (DQO) discussion within the Draft RI/FS Work Plan and the draft Quality Assurance Project Plan. The Respondents shall use information from the scoping meeting (a separate meeting may be required), appropriate EPA guidance, and technical direction provided by the EPA's Remedial Project Manager as the basis for preparing the DQO Section.

The risk assessments require that the sampling be conducted to demonstrate that data is statistically representative of the Site. The Respondents shall also confirm that the detection limits for all laboratories are in accordance within the goals stated in the EPA's risk assessment guidance.

The FSP shall consider the use of all existing data and shall justify the need for additional data whenever existing data will meet the same objective. The FSP shall be written so that a field sampling team unfamiliar with the Site would be able to gather the samples and field information required. The Respondents shall refer to EPA's guidance document entitled, "Interim Final Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA" (EPA 1988b) which describes the RI/FS FSP format and the required content. The Respondents shall document any required changes to the Final FSP, during the implementation of the RI/FS, in a memorandum to the EPA's Remedial Project Manager and after discussions with the EPA.

11.3.2 RI/FS Quality Assurance Project Plan

The RI/FS Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) shall describe the project objectives and organization, functional activities, and quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) protocols that will be used to achieve the desired Data Quality Objectives (DQOs). The DQOs shall at a minimum reflect use of analytical methods for identifying contamination and remediating contamination consistent with the levels for remedial action objectives identified in the NCP. In addition, the RI/FS QAPP shall address sampling procedures; sample custody; analytical procedures; data reduction, validation, and reporting; and personnel qualifications. The Respondents shall refer to the EPA's guidance documents entitled; "EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans, EPA QA/R-5 " (EPA 2001, EPA/240/B-01/003, March 2001, or the latest revision), and "Guidance for Quality Assurance Project Plans, EPA QA/G-5 " (EPA 2002, EPA/240/R-02/009, December 2002, or the latest revision) which describe the RI/FS QAPP format and the required content.

The Respondents shall demonstrate in advance, to the EPA's satisfaction, that each analytical laboratory it may use is qualified to conduct the proposed Work. This includes use of methods and analytical protocols for the chemicals of concern in the media of interest within detection and quantification limits consistent with both QA/QC procedures and the DQOs approved in the RI/FS QAPP for the Site by the EPA. The laboratory must have, and follow, an approved QA program. If a laboratory not in the Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) is selected, methods consistent with CLP methods shall be used where appropriate. Any methods not consistent with CLP methods shall be approved by the EPA prior to their use. Furthermore, if a laboratory not in the CLP program is selected, a laboratory QA program must be submitted to the

EPA for review and approval. The EPA may require the Respondents to submit detailed information to demonstrate that the laboratory is qualified to conduct the Work, including information on personnel and qualifications, equipment, and material specifications.

11.4 Task 4: RI/FS Site Health and Safety Plan

The Respondents shall prepare and submit to the EPA an RI/FS Site Health and Safety Plan (HSP) within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. This RI/FS HSP shall be prepared in accordance with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations and protocols. The EPA will review, but not approve, the RI/FS Site HSP to ensure that all necessary elements are included and that the plan provides for the protection of human health and the environment. The EPA may, at its discretion, disapprove the Site HSP and provide comments concerning those aspects of the plan which pertain to the protection of the environment and the health of persons not employed by, or under contract to, the Respondents. In addition, EPA may require a revised RI/FS Site HSP to be submitted for review in the event that the RI/FS WP is changed or amended (e.g., such as in the performance of pilot studies which may result in the airborne emissions of hazardous substances from the Site). The Respondents shall refer to the EPA's guidance document entitled, "Interim Final Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA" (EPA 1988b) which describes the RI/FS Site HSP format and the required content.

11.5 Task 5: Community Involvement Plan

The EPA has prepared a Community Involvement Plan (CIP) according to the EPA's guidance. This CIP outlines the community involvement activities to be conducted during the RI/FS for the Site. This CIP may be amended and could include, but is not be limited to, the following elements: 1) the Site's background including location, description and history; 2) community overview including a community profile, concerns, and involvement; 3) community involvement objectives and planned activities along with a schedule to accomplish those objectives; 4) mailing list of contacts and interested parties; 5) name and address of the information repository(ies) and public meeting facility locations; 6) mailing list; 7) list of acronyms; and 8) a glossary.

The Respondents shall support the EPA's community relations efforts during the RI/FS, the preparation and presentation of the Proposed Plan to the public, and the preparation of the Record of Decision for the Site (Task 13 - Proposed Plan and Record of Decision Support). Specifically, but not limited to, the Respondents shall provide meeting facilities, technical/administrative representatives, and audio/visual equipment for public meetings and open houses at the EPA's request. The EPA shall prepare and mail fact sheets and meeting notices. The Respondents shall publish public notices of these meetings in local newspapers. The Respondents shall assist the EPA in other community relations efforts (e.g., prepare and/or provide materials [posters, etc.] for public presentations) as requested by the EPA's Remedial Project Manager.

11.6 Task 6: Site Characterization

As part of the Remedial Investigation (RI), the Respondents shall perform the activities described in this Task, including the preparation of an RI Report (Task 11 [Remedial Investigation Report]). The overall objective of the Site's characterization will be to describe areas of the Site that may pose a threat to human health or the environment. This will be accomplished by first determining the Site's physiography, geology, and hydrology. Surface and subsurface pathways of migration shall be defined by the Respondents. The Respondents shall identify the sources of contamination and define the nature, extent, and volume of the sources of contamination, including their physical and chemical constituents. The Respondents shall also investigate the extent of migration of this contamination as well as its volume and any changes in its physical or chemical characteristics, to provide for a comprehensive understanding of the nature and extent of contamination at the Site. Using this information, contaminant fate and transport will then be determined and projected.

The Respondents shall implement the Final RI/FS WP, SAP, and the HSP during this phase of the RI/FS. Field data will be collected and analyzed to provide the information required to accomplish the objectives of the study. The Respondents shall notify the EPA at least fifteen (15) calendar days in advance of the field work regarding the planned dates for field activities, including, but not limited to, ecological field surveys, field layout of the sampling grid, installation of wells, initiating sampling (air, surface water, ground water, sediments, soils, and biota), installation and calibration of equipment, aquifer tests, and initiation of analysis and other field investigation activities (including geophysical surveys and borehole geophysics). The Respondents shall demonstrate that the laboratory and type of laboratory analyses that will be utilized during the Site's characterization meets the specific QA/QC requirements and the DQOs established for the investigation of the Site as specified in the Final RI/FS SAP. Activities are often iterative, and to satisfy the objectives of the RI/FS it may be necessary for the Respondents to supplement the Work specified in the Final RI/FS WP.

11.6.1 Field Investigation

The field investigation shall include the gathering of data to define the Site's physical and biological characteristics, sources of contamination, and the nature and extent of contamination at or from the Site. These activities shall be performed by the Respondents in accordance with the Final RI/FS WP and SAP. At a minimum, this field investigation shall address the following:

a) Implementation and Documentation of Field Support Activities - The Respondents shall initiate field support activities following the Final RI/FS WP and SAP approved by the EPA. Field support activities may include obtaining access to the Site; scheduling; and procurement of equipment, office space, laboratory services, and/or contractors. The Respondents shall notify the EPA at least fifteen (15) calendar days prior to initiating field support activities so that the EPA may adequately schedule oversight activities. The Respondents shall also notify the EPA in writing upon completion of field support activities.

b) Investigation and Definition of Site Physical and Biological Characteristics - The

Respondents shall collect data on the physical and biological characteristics of the Site and its surrounding areas including the physiography, geology, hydrology, and specific physical characteristics identified in the Final RI/FS WP. This information shall be ascertained through a combination of physical measurements, observations, and sampling efforts, and will be utilized to define potential transport pathways and human and ecological receptor populations (including risks to endangered or threatened species). In defining the Site's physical characteristics, the Respondents shall also obtain sufficient engineering data for the projection of contaminant fate and transport, and development and screening of remedial action alternatives, including information to assess treatment technologies.

c) Definition of Sources of Contamination - The Respondents shall locate each source of contamination. For each location, the areal extent and depth of contamination will be determined by sampling at incremental depths on a sampling grid. The physical characteristics and chemical constituents and their concentrations will be determined for all known and discovered sources of contamination. The Respondents shall conduct sufficient sampling to define the boundaries of the contaminant sources to the level established in the Final RI/FS QAPP and DQOs. Defining the source of contamination shall include analyzing the potential for contaminant release (e.g., long-term leaching from soil), contaminant mobility and persistence, and characteristics important for evaluating remedial actions, including information to assess treatment technologies.

d) Description of the Nature and Extent of Contamination - The Respondents shall gather information to describe the nature and extent of contamination, at or from the Site, as a final step during the field investigation. To describe the nature and extent of contamination, the Respondents shall utilize the information on the Site's physical and biological characteristics and sources of contamination to give a preliminary estimate of the contaminants that may have migrated. The Respondents shall then implement an iterative monitoring program and any study program identified in the Final RI/FS WP or SAP such that by using analytical techniques sufficient to detect and quantify the concentration of contaminants, the migration of contaminants through the various media at the Site can be determined. In addition, the Respondents shall gather data for calculations of contaminant fate and transport. This process shall be continued until the area and depth of contamination are known to the level of contamination established in the Final RI/FS QAPP and DQOs. The EPA will use the information on the nature and extent of contamination to determine the level of risk presented by the Site and to help determine aspects of the appropriate remedial action alternatives to be evaluated.

11.6.2 Data Analyses

The Respondents shall analyze the data collected and develop or refine the Conceptual Site Model by presenting and analyzing data on source characteristics, the nature and extent of contamination, the transport pathways and fate of the contaminants present at the Site, and the effects on human health and the environment:

The Respondents shall analyze and evaluate the data to describe the Site's physical and biological characteristics, contaminant source characteristics, nature and extent of contamination, and contaminant fate and transport. Results of the Site's physical characteristics, source characteristics, and extent of contamination analyses are utilized in the analysis of contaminant fate and transport. The evaluation will include the actual and potential magnitude of releases from the sources, and horizontal and vertical spread of contamination as well as the mobility and persistence of the contaminants. Where modeling is appropriate, such models shall be identified by the Respondents to the EPA in a Technical Memorandum prior to their use.

All data and programming, including any proprietary programs, shall be made available to the EPA together with a sensitivity analysis. The RI data shall be presented in a format to facilitate the Respondent's preparation of the Baseline Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessments (Task 9 [Risk Assessments]). All data shall be archived in a database in such a format that would be accessible to investigators as needed.

The Respondents shall agree to discuss and then collect additional data for any data gaps identified by the EPA that are needed to complete the risk assessments. Also, this evaluation shall provide any information relevant to the Site's characteristics necessary for evaluation of the need for remedial action in the risk assessments and for the development and evaluation of remedial alternatives. Analyses of data collected for the Site's characterization shall meet the DQOs developed in the Final RI/FS QAPP and stated in the Final RI/FS SAP (or revised during the RI).

11.6.3 Data Management Procedures

The Respondents shall consistently document the quality and validity of field and laboratory data compiled during the RI as follows:

a) Documentation of Field Activities - Information gathered during the Site's characterization shall be consistently documented and adequately recorded by the Respondents in well maintained field logs and laboratory reports. The method(s) of documentation shall be specified in the Final RI/FS WP and/or the SAP. Field logs shall be utilized to document observations, measurements, and significant events that have occurred during field activities. Laboratory reports shall document sample custody, analytical responsibility and results, adherence to prescribed protocols, nonconformity events, corrective measures, and data deficiencies.

b) Sample Management and Tracking - The Respondents shall maintain field reports, sample shipment records, analytical results, and QA/QC reports to ensure that only validated analytical data are reported and utilized in the risk assessments and the development and evaluation of remedial alternatives. Analytical results developed under the Final RI/FS WP shall not be included in any characterization reports of the Site unless accompanied by or cross-referenced to a corresponding QA/QC report. In addition, the Respondents shall establish a data security system to safeguard chain-of-custody forms and other project records to prevent loss, damage, or alteration of project documentation.

11.7 Task 7: Data Validation

The Respondents shall arrange for the validation of environmental samples collected during the RI/FS for the Site. The Respondents shall prepare and ship for analyses ground water, surface/subsurface soil, surface water, sediment, biota, and any other samples as directed by the EPA's Remedial Project Manager. The Respondents shall coordinate with the appropriate analytical laboratory personnel, implement an EPA-approved laboratory QA program, and provide sample management (e.g., chain of custody, sample retention, and data storage) to ensure the proper management of samples. The Respondents shall validate the data and review the data against validation criteria to ensure that the data are accurate and defensible.

The Respondents shall routinely perform data validation throughout the RI/FS. The Respondents shall include a section in the RI Report that addresses the Data Validation process, issues and discrepancies identified, potential impacts on data quality and usability, and resolutions implemented. The Respondents shall prepare and submit all Data Validation Reports (DVR) as an Appendix to the RI Report.

11.8 Task 8: Data Evaluation

The Respondents shall organize and evaluate existing data and data gathered during the RI/FS. The Respondents shall evaluate the usability of the data and interpret and tabulate the data in an appropriate presentation format for final data tables. The Respondents shall design and set up an appropriate database for pertinent information collected that will be used during the RI/FS. The Respondents shall evaluate the geological soil and sediment data, groundwater data, surface water data, waste data, geophysical data, and ecological data. The Respondents shall perform modeling, if necessary.

The Respondents shall routinely perform data evaluation throughout the RI/FS in an attempt to identify data gaps early in the process. The Respondents shall include a section in the RI Report that addresses the Data Evaluation process, issues and discrepancies identified, potential impacts on data quality and usability, and resolutions implemented. Any data evaluation reports produced during the RI/FS process shall be included as an appendix to the RI Report.

11.9 Task 9: Risk Assessments

The Respondents shall perform a Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment, Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment, and a Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (if necessary) for the Site, which will be a part of the RI Report. The Respondents will prepare one section of the Final RI/FS WP (Task 2 [Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study Work Plan]) which discusses the risk assessment process and outlines the steps necessary for coordinating with the EPA at key decision points within the process. Submittal of deliverables, meetings and/or conference calls, and presentations to the EPA will be reflected in the project schedule in the Final RI/FS WP to demonstrate the progress made on the risk assessments. The DQOs listed

within the Final RI/FS QAPP will include DQOs specific to risk assessment needs, and critical samples needed for the risk assessments will be identified within the Final RI/FS SAP. The Respondents shall develop an initial Conceptual Site Model which may be revised as new information is obtained. These risk assessments shall consist of both Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessments as follows:

11.9.1 Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment

The Respondents shall perform a Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment (BHHRA) to evaluate and assess the risk to human health posed by the contaminants present at the Site. The Respondents shall refer to the appropriate EPA guidance documents (EPA 1989b, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c, 1992a, and 2001b) in conducting the BHHRA. The Respondents shall address the following in the BHHRA:

a) Hazard Identification (sources) - The Respondents shall review available information on the hazardous substances present at the Site and identify the major contaminants of concern.

b) Dose-Response Assessment - The Respondents, with concurrence from the EPA, shall select contaminants of concern based on their intrinsic toxicological properties and distribution in the environment.

c) Conceptual Exposure/Pathway Analysis - The Respondents shall identify and analyze critical exposure pathways (e.g., drinking water). The proximity of contaminants to exposure pathways and their potential to migrate into critical exposure pathways shall be assessed.

d) Characterization of Site and Potential Receptors - The Respondents shall identify and characterize human populations in the exposure pathways.

e) Exposure Assessment - During the exposure assessment, the Respondents shall identify the magnitude of actual or potential human exposures, the frequency and duration of these exposures, and the routes by which receptors are exposed. The exposure assessment shall include an evaluation of the likelihood of such exposures occurring and shall provide the basis for the development of acceptable exposure levels. In developing the exposure assessment, the Respondents shall develop reasonable maximum estimates of exposure for both current land use conditions and potential future land use conditions at the Site.

f) Risk Characterization - During risk characterization, the Respondents shall compare chemical-specific toxicity information, combined with quantitative and qualitative information from the exposure assessment, to measured levels of contaminant exposure levels and the levels predicted through environmental fate and transport modeling. These comparisons shall determine whether concentrations of contaminants at or near the Site are affecting or could potentially affect human health.

g) Identification of Limitations/Uncertainties - The Respondents shall identify critical assumptions (e.g., background concentrations and conditions) and uncertainties in the BHHRA.

h) Conceptual Site Model - Based on contaminant identification, exposure assessment, toxicity assessment, and risk characterization, the Respondents shall develop a Conceptual Site Model for the Site.

The Respondents shall prepare and submit to the EPA for review and approval, according to the schedule specified in the Final RI/FS Work Plan, a Draft BHHRA. The Respondents shall submit a Final BHHRA within fourteen (14) calendar days after the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft BHHRA.

11.9.2 Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment

The Respondents shall perform the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA) concurrently with the BHHRA. The BERA shall conform to current EPA guidance (EPA 1992a, EPA 1992b, EPA 1993, EPA 1997, and EPA 2001b). The scoping of all phases of the BERA shall follow the general approach provided in the EPA's guidance (EPA 1997) and shall include discussions between the Respondents and the EPA's risk assessors and risk managers. The BERA shall conform to the general outline provided in the EPA's guidance (EPA 1997).

The eight steps in the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA) process include: Step 1 - Screening-Level Problem Formulation and Ecological Effects Evaluation, Step 2 - Screening-Level Preliminary Exposure Estimate and Risk Calculation, Step 3 - Baseline Risk Assessment Problem Formulation, Step 4 - Study Design and Data Quality Objectives, Step 5 - Field Verification and Sampling Design, Step 6 - Site Investigation and Analysis of Exposure and Effects, Step 7 - Risk Characterization, and Step 8 - Risk Management. The Respondents shall interact closely with the EPA's Remedial Project Manager and risk assessment staff assigned to the Site to ensure that draft deliverables are acceptable and major rework is avoided on subsequent submittals. The scope of the BERA will be determined via a phased approach as outlined in the EPA's guidance documents and documented in the following deliverables:

a) Step 1, Screening Level Problem Formulation and Ecological Effects Evaluation - The "Screening Level Problem Formulation and Ecological Effects Evaluation" step is part of the initial ecological risk screening assessment. For this initial step, it is likely that site-specific information for determining the nature and extent of contamination and for characterizing ecological receptors at the Site is limited. This step includes all the functions of problem formulation (Steps 3 and 4) and ecological effects analysis, but on a screening level. The results of this step will be used in conjunction with exposure estimates during the preliminary risk calculation in Step 2 (Screening-Level Preliminary Exposure Estimate and Risk Calculation).

For the screening level problem formulation, the Respondents shall develop a

Conceptual Site Model that addresses these five issues: 1) environmental setting and contaminants known or suspected to exist at the Site, 2) contaminant fate and transport mechanisms that might exist at the Site, 3) the mechanisms of ecotoxicity associated with contaminants and likely categories of receptors that could be affected, 4) the complete exposure pathways that might exist at the Site, and 5) selection of endpoints to screen for ecological risk.

The next step in the initial ecological risk screening assessment will be the preliminary ecological effects evaluation and the establishment of contaminant exposure levels that represent conservative thresholds for adverse ecological effects. Screening ecotoxicity values shall represent a no-observed-adverse-effect-level for long-term exposures to a contaminant. Ecological effects of most concern are those that can impact populations (or higher levels of biological organizations) and include adverse effects on development, reproduction, and survivorship. For some of the data reported in the literature, conversions may be necessary to allow the data to be used for measures of exposure other than those reported. The Respondents shall consult with the EPA's Remedial Project Manager and risk assessors concerning any extrapolations used in developing screening ecotoxicity values.

b) Step 2, Screening-Level Exposure Estimate and Risk Calculation - The "Screening-Level Exposure Estimate and Risk Calculation" comprises the second step in the ecological risk screening assessment for the Site. Risk is estimated by comparing maximum documented exposure concentrations with the ecotoxicity screening values from Step 1. At the conclusion of Step 2, the Respondents shall decide, with concurrence from the EPA, that either the screening-level ecological risk assessment is adequate to determine that ecological threats are negligible, or the process should continue to a more detailed ecological risk assessment (Steps 3 through 7). If the process continues, the screening-level assessment serves to identify exposure pathways and preliminary contaminants of concern for the BERA by eliminating those contaminants and exposure pathways that pose negligible risks.

To estimate exposures for the screening-level ecological risk calculation, on-site contaminant levels and general information on the types of biological receptors that might be exposed should be known from Step 1. Only complete exposure pathways should be evaluated and the highest measured or estimated on-site contaminant concentration for each environmental medium should be used to estimate exposures, thereby ensuring that potential ecological threats are not missed.

The Respondents will estimate a quantitative screening-level risk using the exposure estimates developed according to Step 2 and the screening ecotoxicity values developed according to Step 1. For the screening-level risk calculation, the hazard quotient approach, which compares point estimates of screening ecotoxicity values and exposure values, is adequate to estimate risk.

At the end of Step 2, the Respondents shall decide, with concurrence from the EPA,

whether the information available is adequate to support a risk management decision. The three possible decisions at this point will be: 1) There is adequate information to conclude that ecological risks are negligible and therefore no need for remediation on the basis of ecological risk; 2) The information is not adequate to make a decision at this point, and the ecological risk assessment process will continue to Step 3; or 3) The information indicates a potential for adverse ecological effects, and a more thorough assessment is warranted. The Respondents shall document the decision and the basis for it in a Draft Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment (SLERA) Report and submit it to the EPA for review and approval according to the project schedule in the Final RI/FS WP. The Respondents shall submit a Final SLERA within fourteen (14) calendar days of the EPA's approval of the Draft SLERA.

c) Step 3, Baseline Risk Assessment Problem Formulation - The "Baseline Risk Assessment Problem Formulation" step of the BERA will refine the screening-level problem formulation and expands on the ecological issues that are of concern at the Site. In the screening-level assessment, conservative assumptions are used where site-specific information is lacking. In Step 3, the results of the screening assessment and additional site-specific information are used to determine the scope and goals of the BERA. Steps 3 through 7 will be required only if the screening-level assessment, in Steps 1 and 2, indicated a need for further ecological risk evaluation.

Problem formulation at Step 3 will include the following activities: a) refining preliminary contaminants of ecological concern; b) further characterizing ecological effects of contaminants; c) reviewing and refining information on contaminant fate and transport, complete exposure pathways, and ecosystems potentially at risk; d) selecting assessment endpoints; and e) developing a CSM with working hypotheses or questions that the Site investigation will address.

At the conclusion of Step 3, the Respondents shall participate in a scoping meeting prior to developing the BERA work plan and SAP, such that a consensus on some of the key problem formulation issues is reached and acceptable to all parties. This meeting shall discuss the assessment endpoints, exposure pathways, risk questions, and the CSM integrating these components. The products of Step 3 will be used to select measurement endpoints and to develop the BERA Work Plan (WP) and Sampling and Analysis (SAP) for the Site in Step 4.

d) Step 4, Study Design and Data Quality Objective Process - The "Study Design and Data Quality Objective Process" step of the BERA will establish the measurement endpoints which complete the CSM in Step 3. The CSM will then be used to develop the study design and DQOs. The deliverables of Step 4 will be the BERA WP and SAP, which describe the details of the Site's investigation as well as the data analysis methods and DQOs. The BERA WP will contain a summary of Step 3-Baseline Risk Assessment Problem Formulation. The Draft BERA WP shall describe the assessment endpoints, exposure pathways, questions and testable hypotheses, measurement endpoints and their relation to assessment endpoints, and uncertainties and assumptions. The Draft BERA

SAP shall describe data needs; scientifically valid and sufficient study design and data analysis procedures; study methodology and protocols, including sampling techniques; data reduction and interpretation techniques, including statistical analyses; and quality assurance procedures and quality control techniques. The Respondents shall submit to the EPA for review and approval a Draft BERA WP and SAP according to the schedule specified in the Final RI/FS Work Plan. The Respondents shall submit a Final BERA WP and SAP with fourteen (14) calendar days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft BERA WP and SAP.

e) Step 5, Field Verification of Sampling Design - The "Field Verification of Sampling Design" step of the BERA process will ensure that the DQOs for the Site can be met. This step verifies that the selected assessment endpoints, testable hypotheses, exposure pathway model, measurement endpoints, and study design from Steps 3 and 4 are appropriate and implementable at the Site. Step 6 of the BERA process cannot begin until the Final BERA WP and SAP are approved by the EPA.

f) Step 6, Site Investigation and Analysis Phase - The "Site Investigation and Analysis Phase" of the BERA process shall follow the Final BERA WP and SAP developed in Step 4 and verified in Step 5. The Step 6 results are then used to characterize ecological risks in Step 7.

The Final BERA WP for the Site investigation will be based on the CSM and will specify the assessment endpoints, risk questions, and testable hypotheses. During the Site investigation, the Respondents shall adhere to the DQOs and to any requirements for co-located sampling. The analysis phase of the BERA process will consist of the technical evaluation of data on existing and potential exposures and ecological effects at the Site. This analysis will be based on the information collected during Steps 1 through 5 and will include additional assumptions or models to interpret the data in the context of the CSM. Changing field conditions and new information on the nature and extent of contamination may require a change to the Final BERA SAP.

g) Step 7 - Risk Characterization - The "Risk Characterization" step is considered the final phase of the BERA process and will include two major components: risk estimation and risk description. Risk estimation will consist of integrating the exposure profiles with the exposure-effects information and summarizing the associated uncertainties. The risk description will provide information important for interpreting the risk results and will identify a threshold for adverse effects on the assessment endpoints. At the end of Step 7, the Respondents shall submit a Draft BERA Report to EPA for review and approval according to the project schedule in the Final RI/FS WP. The Respondents shall submit a Final BERA Report within fourteen (14) calendar days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft BERA Report.

h) Step 8 - Risk Management – "Risk Management" at the Site will be the responsibility of the EPA's Remedial Project Manager and risk assessor(s), who must balance risk reductions associated with cleanup of contaminants with potential impacts of the remedial

actions themselves. In Step 7, a threshold for effects on the assessment endpoint as a range between contamination levels identified as posing no ecological risk and the lowest contamination levels identified as likely to produce adverse ecological effects will be identified. In Step 8, the EPA's Remedial Project Manager and risk assessor(s) will evaluate several factors in deciding whether or not to clean up to within that range. This risk management decision will be finalized by the EPA in the Record of Decision for the Site.

11.10 Task 10: Treatability Studies

Treatability testing, if necessary, shall be performed by the Respondents to assist in the detailed analysis of alternatives. In addition, if applicable, testing results and operating conditions shall be used in the detailed design of the selected remedial technology. The following activities shall be performed by the Respondents:

a) Determination of Candidate Technologies and of the Need for Testing - The Respondents shall identify in a Candidate Technologies Technical Memorandum (CTTM) the candidate technologies for a treatability studies program. The Respondents shall submit a Draft CTTM to the EPA for review and approval according to the project schedule specified in the Final RI/FS WP. The Respondents shall submit a Final CTTM within fourteen (14) calendar days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft CTTM.

The listing of candidate technologies will cover the range of technologies required for alternatives analysis. The specific data requirements for the testing program will be determined and refined during the characterization of the Site and the development and screening of remedial alternatives. The Respondents shall perform the following activities:

i) Conduct of Literature Survey and Determination of the Need for Treatability Testing - The Respondents shall conduct a literature survey to gather information on performance, relative costs, applicability, removal efficiencies, operation and maintenance requirements, and implementability of candidate technologies. If practical technologies have not been sufficiently demonstrated, or cannot be adequately evaluated for this Site on the basis of available information, treatability testing may need to be conducted. Where it is determined by the EPA that treatability testing is required, and unless the Respondents can demonstrate to the EPA's satisfaction that they are not needed, the Respondents shall be required to submit a Treatability Study Work Plan to the EPA outlining the steps and data necessary to evaluate and initiate the treatability testing program.

ii) Evaluation of Treatability Studies - Once a decision has been made to perform treatability studies, the Respondents and the EPA will decide on the type of treatability testing to use (e.g., bench versus pilot, etc.). Because of the time required to design, fabricate, and install pilot scale equipment as well as perform testing for

various operating conditions, the decision to perform pilot testing shall be made as early in the process as possible to minimize potential delays of the Feasibility Study (Task 12). The Respondents shall submit a Draft Treatability Study Work Plan (TSWP), Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP), and Health and Safety Plan within thirty (30) calendar days after the receipt of the notice from the EPA that treatability studies are required. The Respondents shall submit a Final TSWP, SAP, and HSP within fourteen (14) calendar days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft TSWP, SAP, and HSP. The EPA will not approve the TS HSP but may provide comments to the Respondents.

The Respondents shall submit a Draft Treatability Study (TS) Report to the EPA for review and approval according to the project schedule in the Final Treatability Study Work Plan. The Respondents shall submit a Final TS Report within fourteen (14) calendar days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft TS Report. This report shall evaluate the technology's effectiveness and implementability in relation to the Preliminary Remediation Goals established for the Site. Actual results must be compared with predicted results to justify effectiveness and implementability discussions.

11.11 Task 11: Remedial Investigation Report

The Respondents shall prepare and submit a Remedial Investigation (RI) Report. The Respondents shall refer to the EPA's guidance document entitled, "Interim Final Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA" (EPA 1988b), including Table 3-13 (Suggested RI Report Format), for the RI Report format and the required content. The Respondents shall discuss the RI Report format and the required content with the EPA's Remedial Project Manager early in the RI/FS process. The information shall include a summary of the results of the field activities to characterize the Site, classification of ground water beneath the Site, nature and extent of contamination for all media, and appropriate site-specific discussions for fate and transport of contaminants. The Respondents shall incorporate the results of Task 9 (Risk Assessments) into the RI Report, as appropriate.

The Respondents shall submit a Draft RI Report to the EPA for review and approval according to the project schedule in the Final RI/FS Work Plan. The Respondents shall submit a Final RI Report within fourteen (14) calendar days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft RI Report.

11.12 Task 12: Feasibility Study

The Respondents shall perform a Feasibility Study (FS) as specified in this SOW. The FS shall include, but not be limited to, the Development and Screening of Alternatives for Remedial Action, a Detailed Analysis of Alternatives for Remedial Action, Submittal of Draft and Final FS Reports, and other reports/memoranda as follows:

a) Development and Screening of Alternatives for Remedial Action - The Respondents

shall develop an appropriate range of remedial alternatives that will be evaluated through development and screening. The Respondents shall develop draft site-specific preliminary remediation goals as well as a draft list of Remedial Action Objectives (RAO) which includes RAOs for engineering controls as well as for institutional controls.

The Respondents shall submit a Draft Alternatives Development and Screening Memorandum (ADSM) to the EPA for review and approval according the project schedule in the Final RI/FS Work Plan. The Draft ADSM shall summarize the assembled alternatives for each affected medium and the chemical-, location-, and action-specific ARARs for each of the considered alternatives. The reasons for eliminating alternatives during the preliminary screening process shall be specified. The ADSM shall summarize the results of the screening process in relation to the Remedial Action Objectives and the more specific Preliminary Remediation Goals for the Site. The Respondents shall submit a Final ADSM within fourteen (14) calendar days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft ADSM.

b) Detailed Analyses of Alternatives for Remedial Action - The Respondents shall conduct a detailed analysis of remedial alternatives for the candidate remedies identified during the screening process described in this Task. This detailed analysis shall follow the EPA's guidance document entitled, "Interim Final Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA" (EPA 1988b) and other appropriate guidance documents. The major components of the Detailed Analysis of Alternatives for Remedial Action shall consist of an analysis of each option against a set of evaluation criteria and a separate discussion for the comparative analysis of all options with respect to each other in a manner consistent with the NCP. The Respondents shall not consider state and community acceptance during the Detailed Analysis of Alternatives. The EPA will perform the analysis of these two criteria. At the conclusion of the Detailed Analysis of Alternatives and within the time frame specified in the project schedule in the Final RI/FS WP, the Respondents shall provide the EPA with a Draft FS Report as outlined below which includes the Detailed Analysis of Alternatives. The analysis of remedial alternatives shall consist of the following deliverables:

i) Nine Criteria Analysis - The Respondents shall submit to the EPA a Draft Nine Criteria Analysis within the Draft FS Report, summarizing the results of the nine criteria evaluation, according to the project schedule in the Final RI/FS WP. The evaluation criteria will include: overall protection of human health and the environment; compliance with ARARs; long-term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume; short-term effectiveness; implementability; cost; state acceptance; and community acceptance.

ii) Remedial Alternatives Comparative Analysis - The Respondents shall submit a Remedial Alternatives Comparative Analysis within the Draft FS Report, which summarizes the results of the comparative analysis of the remedial alternatives.

iii) Analysis for Institutional Controls - The Alternatives Analysis for Institutional Controls and Screening shall (1) state the objectives (i.e., what will be accomplished) for the Institutional Controls; (2) determine the specific types of Institutional Controls that can be used to meet the remedial action objectives; (3) investigate when the Institutional Controls need to be implemented and/or secured and how long they must be in place; and (4) research, discuss and document any agreement with the proper entities (e.g., state, local government entities, local landowners, conservation organizations, Respondents) on exactly who will be responsible for securing, maintaining and enforcing the Institutional Controls. The Alternatives Analysis for Institutional Controls shall also evaluate the Institutional Controls identified in the Development and Screening of Alternatives Memorandum against the nine evaluation criteria outlined in the NCP (40 C.F.R. 300.430(e)(9)(iii)) for CERCLA cleanups, including but not limited to costs to implement, monitor and/or enforce the Institutional Controls.

iv) Presentation to EPA – Within seven (7) days prior to the submittal of the draft FS Report, the Respondents shall participate in a RI/FS meeting to discuss the findings of the RI, Remedial Action Objectives, alternatives (engineering and institutional control options) evaluated in the FS, the nine criteria analysis, and the comparative analysis of alternatives.

c) Feasibility Study Report - The Respondents shall submit to the EPA, for review and approval, a Draft FS Report which documents the activities conducted during the Development and Screening of Alternatives and the Detailed Analyses of Alternatives, as described above, according to the project schedule in the Final RI/FS WP. The Respondents shall refer to the EPA's guidance document entitled, "Interim Final Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA" (EPA 1988b), specifically Table 6-5 (Suggested FS Report Format) for FS Report content and format. The Respondents shall submit a Final FS Report within fourteen (14) calendar days of the receipt of the EPA's comments on the Draft FS Report.

11.13 Task 13: Proposed Plan and Record of Decision Support

The Respondents shall support the EPA's Remedial Project Manager in the preparation of the Proposed Plan and Record of Decision (ROD) for the Site. This support shall include, but is not limited to, the preparation of maps, drawings, tables, attachments, and appendices that the EPA intends to include in the Proposed Plan and the ROD.

ATTACHMENT A
SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES/MEETINGS
STATEMENT OF WORK
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDY
BRINE SERVICE COMPANY, INC. SUPERFUND SITE

DELIVERABLE	DUE DATE (CALENDAR DAYS)
1. Scoping Phase Meeting	Meeting to occur within fourteen (14) days after the effective date of the AOC.
2. Draft and Final RI/FS Work Plan (WP)	Draft due within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft RI/FS WP.
2a. Draft and Final Site Management Plan (SMP)	Draft to be included as part of the draft RI/FS Work Plan which is due within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. Final to be included as part of the final RI/FS Work Plan due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft.
2b. Draft and Final Pollution Control and Mitigation Plan (PCMP)	Draft to be included as part of the draft RI/FS Work Plan which is due within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. Final to be included as part of the final RI/FS Work Plan due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft.
2c. Draft and Final Transportation and Disposal Plan (TDP)	Draft to be included as part of the draft RI/FS Work Plan which is due within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. Final to be included as part of the final RI/FS Work Plan due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft.
2d. Draft and Final Data Management Plan (DMP)	Draft to be included as part of the draft RI/FS Work Plan which is due within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. Final to be included as part of the final RI/FS Work Plan due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft.
2e. Draft and Final Conceptual Site Model (CSM)	Draft to be included as part of the draft RI/FS Work Plan which is due within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. Final to be included as part of the final RI/FS Work Plan due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft.
3. Draft and Final RI/FS Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP)	Draft due within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft RI/FS SAP.
3a. Draft and Final Data Quality Objectives (DQOs)	Draft to be included as part of the draft SAP which is due within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA. Final to be included as part of the final SAP due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft.
4. RI/FS Site Health and Safety Plan	Plan due within thirty (30) calendar days after the Respondents obtain an authorization to proceed from EPA.

ATTACHMENT A (CONTD.)
SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES/MEETINGS
STATEMENT OF WORK
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDY
BRINE SERVICE COMPANY, INC. SUPERFUND SITE

DELIVERABLES/MEETINGS	DUE DATES (CALENDAR DAYS)
5. Draft and Final Data Validation Report (DVR)	Draft and Final reports are due as part of the draft and final RI Report.
6. Draft and Final Data Evaluation Summary (DESR)	Draft and Final summaries are due as part of the draft and final RI Report.
7. Draft and Final Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment (BHHRA)	Draft due as specified in the Final RI/FS WP. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft RI/FS BHHRA.
8. Draft and Final Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment (SLERA) Report	Draft due as specified in the Final RI/FS WP. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft SLERA Report.
9. Draft and Final Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment Work Plan (BERA WP) and Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP)	Draft due as specified in the Final RI/FS WP. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft BERA WP and SAP.
9a. Draft and Final Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment Problem Formulation (BERA PF)	Draft due as part of the draft BERA Work Plan. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft BERA WP and SAP.
10. Draft and Final Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA) Report	Draft due as specified in the Final RI/FS WP. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft BERA Report.
11. Draft and Final Candidate Technologies Technical Memorandum (CTTM)	Draft due as specified in the Final RI/FS WP. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft CTTM.
12. Draft and Final Treatability Study (TS) Work Plan (WP), Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP), and Health and Safety Plan	Draft due within thirty (30) days of the receipt of EPA's notice that treatability studies are required. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft TS WP and SAP.
13. Draft and Final Treatability Study (TS) Report	Draft due as specified in the Final Treatability Study WP. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft TS Report.

ATTACHMENT A (CONTD.)
SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES/MEETINGS
STATEMENT OF WORK
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDY
BRINE SERVICE COMPANY, INC. SUPERFUND SITE

DELIVERABLE	DUE DATE (CALENDAR DAYS)
14. Draft and Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report	Draft due as specified in the Final RI/FS WP. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft RI Report.
15. Draft and Final Alternatives Development and Screening Memorandum (ADSM)	Draft due as specified in the Final RI/FS WP. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's approval of the Draft ADSM.
15a. Draft and Final Remedial Action Objectives (RAO) and preliminary remediation goals	Draft due as part of the Draft ADSM. Final due as part of the Final ADSM.
16. Draft and Final Feasibility Study (FS) Report	Draft due as specified in the Final RI/FS WP. Final due within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the EPA's comments on the Draft FS Report.
16a. Draft and Final Nine Criteria Analysis (NCAM)	Draft due as part of the Draft FS Report. Final due as part of the Final FS Report.
16b. Draft and Final Remedial Alternatives Comparative Analysis (RACA)	Draft due as part of the Draft FS Report. Final due as part of the Final FS Report.
16c. Presentation to the EPA.	Presentation to be conducted within seven (7) days prior to the submittal of the Draft FS Report.
17. Monthly Progress Reports	Due by the tenth day of the following month following the effective date of the Order.

ATTACHMENT B
GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDY
BRINE SERVICE COMPANY, INC. SUPERFUND SITE

The following list comprises some of the guidance documents that are applicable to the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study process. The Respondents should consult with EPA's Remedial Project Manager for additional guidance and to ensure that the following guidance documents have not been superseded by more recent guidance:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 1987a. "Data Quality Objectives for Remedial Response Activities." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response and Office of Waste Programs Enforcement. EPA/540/G-87/003. OSWER Directive No. 9335.0-7b. March 1987.

EPA 1987b. "Interim Guidance on Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. OSWER Directive No. 9234.0-05. July 9, 1987.

EPA 1988a. "CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. OSWER Directive No. 9234.1-01. August 1988.

EPA 1988b. "Interim Final Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. EPA/540/G-89/004. OSWER Directive No. 9355.3-01. October 1988.

EPA 1989a. "CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual: Part II. Clean Air Act and Other Environmental Statutes and State Requirements." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. OSWER Directive No. 9234.1-02. August 1989.

EPA 1989b. "Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume I, Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A)." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. EPA/540/1-89/002. OSWER Directive No. 9285.7-01A. December 1989.

EPA 1991a. "Human Health Evaluation Manual, Supplemental Guidance: Standard Default Exposure Factors." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. OSWER Directive No. 9235.6-03. March 1991.

EPA 1991b. "Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Volume I, Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part B), Development of Risk-Based Preliminary Remediating Goals." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. OSWER Directive No. 9285.7-01B. December 1991.

EPA 1991c. "Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Volume I, Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part C), Risk Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. OSWER Directive No. 9285.7-01C. 1991.

EPA 1992a. "Guidance for Data Useability in Risk Assessment." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. OSWER Directive No. 9285.7-09A. April 1992 (and Memorandum from Henry L. Longest dated June 2, 1992).

EPA 1992b. "Supplemental Guidance to RAGS: Calculating the Concentration Term." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. OSWER Directive No. 9285.7-081. May 1992.

EPA 1997. "Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Process for Designing and Conducting Ecological Risk Assessments." Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. EPA/540-R-97-006. June 5, 1997.

EPA 2000. "Guidance for the Data Quality Objectives Process." EPA QA/G-4, EPA/600/R-96/055. August 2000.

EPA 2001a. "EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans." Office of Environmental Information. EPA QA/R-5. EPA/240/B-01/003. March 2001.

EPA 2001b. "Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume 1 - Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part D, Standardized Planning, Reporting, and Review of Superfund Risk Assessments). Final. Publication 9285.7-47. December 2001.

EPA 2002. "EPA Guidance for Quality Assurance Project Plans." EPA QA/G-5. EPA/240/R-02/009. December 2002.

ATTACHMENT C
APPLICABLE OR RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDY
BRINE SERVICE COMPANY, INC. SUPERFUND SITE

A preliminary list of probable Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) will be generated by the Respondents during the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study process. This list will be compiled according to established EPA guidance, research of existing regulations, and collection of site-specific information and data. Three types of ARARs will be identified:

1) Chemical-Specific ARARs: These ARARs are usually health- or risk-based numerical values or methodologies used to determine acceptable concentrations of chemicals that may be found in or discharged to the environment (e.g., maximum contaminant levels that establish safe levels in drinking water).

2) Location-Specific ARARs: These ARARs restrict actions or contaminant concentrations in certain environmentally sensitive areas. Examples of areas regulated under various Federal laws include flood plains, wetlands, and locations where endangered species or historically significant cultural resources are present.

3) Action-Specific ARARs: These ARARs are usually technology- or activity-based requirements or limitations on actions or conditions involving specific substances.

Chemical- and location-specific ARARs are identified early in the process, generally during the site investigation, while action-specific ARARs are usually identified during the Feasibility Study in the detailed analysis of alternatives.